

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Overall Rating

4

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Population Growth		182%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	4	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

Non-Evaluative Comments

None.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	Fresno, County of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	Fresno County Public Library
<i>Project Type/Priority:</i>	New Construction of Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	9,735
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$2,807,698

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Age and Condition of Existing Library

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

Age Rating

- 4 = No Existing Facility
- 4 = 1949 or older
- 3 = 1950-1959
- 2 = 1960-1964
- 1 = 1965-1974
- 0 = 1975-2003

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4

Structural Renovation Rating

- 4 = No Renovation
- 4 = 1954 & earlier
- 3 = 1955-1962
- 2 = 1963-1972
- 1 = 1973-1978
- 0 = 1979-2003

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4

- 4 = Extremely Poor Condition
- 3 = Poor condition
- 2 = Acceptable condition
- 1 = Good condition
- 0 = Very good condition

Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	4	4
4	3	3
4	4	3
3	4	4

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: 1944
 Library renovation date: None

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

R1:

Built in 1944, the current, leased facility cannot support an appropriate level of library technology. ADA access is poor, with floor level changes that preclude the use of more than 40% of the building's square footage for public services. Because the library is undersized, service areas and functions for all ages overlap, making it confusing to navigate and creating unacceptable noise levels. Collections and furnishings create an overcrowding environment, stack aisles are narrow, and traffic patterns are awkward. The single small restroom is not easily accessible to any library visitor and is completely inaccessible to people who have physical disabilities. The concrete and plaster construction of the building is inefficient, with single-paned windows and no apparent insulation. The HVAC system is marginal and there is no air-conditioning in the facility. During the rainy season the building springs troublesome roof leaks that threaten to damage the collections. There is no dedicated parking for the library. The leased building has not been updated to current seismic safety standards.

R2:

This old, leased building serving as a library is wholly inadequate. It is just a very small, commercial store front structure with no air conditioning, no water fountain, one toilet, and asbestos and lead paint that adversely affects consideration of any truly useful renovations. At 88 years old, this building has seismic compliance issues, no insulation, and is severely lacking in energy conservation.

R3:

This 1944 building has served as the leased space for the library for many years. It is a storefront property with parking available on the street which competes with the surrounding commercial interests. The floor is split level so part of the building is not wheelchair accessible at all. Windows are only in the front as is typical of older strip commercial areas. High ceilings prevent effective lighting of reading areas. The building has no water fountain, one toilet for all users, no air conditioning which causes a change of hours during the summer to avoid the heat. Asbestos and lead paint are present. This small rural branch has lived beyond its life expectancy.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Needs and Response to Needs

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	4	4
4	4	4

Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
2	3	2

Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	3
4	4	4
4	3	4
4	4	4

Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
4	4	4
2	2	2
3	2	2
3	3	3
2	2	2
4	4	4
4	4	4

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The applicant used a variety of techniques to gather input from this rural Fresno County community. Techniques used included: 2 focus groups (child development center staff and seniors); 2 community forums; 8 key informant interviews; Results and information about these sessions was included in appendices and was referred to throughout the application. In addition, Godbe Research conducted a system wide telephone survey to assess service priorities and customer satisfaction--programs and services for children and youth ranked in the top three categories in that survey. The analysis of the community was outstanding and described how this small community and its residents are making every possible effort to improve their lives and living conditions because they recognize the need to have knowledge and skills that will enable them to improve their lives and the lives of their children which in turn will help the community. 43.7% of the population is between the ages of 0-19 so there is an emphasis on reaching and working with families. A special effort was made to include input not only from library users, but also from non-users including parents of preschool children who had never been in the library. Population is projected to increase by 28% by 2020 and the student population will grow by 28%. Results from the needs assessment have been taken and have become the foundation upon which library services have been developed. Have done an excellent job at identifying needs and translating those needs into proposed services for teens, adults, seniors, students, children. 87.7% of the population is Hispanic and the proposed increase of the Spanish Language collection (22%) seems small in light of the demographics and the statement that the children need to retain their Spanish Language skills in addition to using English re-enforces the need to provide Spanish Language materials for children. 15% of the collection seems to be an appropriate allocation for teens and 43% for children.

PLAN OF SERVICE

Nine core service responses were developed to address the complex socioeconomic needs expressed by the residents. Some goals are library-centered and some of the proposed objectives are measurable while service indicators seem to be library-centered rather than client-centered. Each goal includes objectives and specific to objectives related to the facility and to the collections. Current staffing levels include .8FTE Library Assistant, a part-time aide, and a part-time janitor, which is small for a 32 hour a week facility, however there are plans to increase the staff and to extend the hours, which was requested by the community. Copies of the jurisdictional planning documents are included.

BUILDING PROGRAM

An excellent general requirements section both in terms of comprehensiveness and detail.
An excellent description of the library's spatial relationships both in narrative and graphic form.
Outstanding and extremely well detailed space descriptions that appear to be appropriately sized.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The building program requires 7,254 net assignable square footage, or 75% of the 9,672 gross square footage. The floor plan provides 7,243 net assignable square footage, or 74% of the 9,735 gross square footage. The floor plan has met building program square footage requirements in an exceptional manner for both assignable and non-assignable square footage.

Except for two isolated instances, the spatial relationships illustrated on the floor plan match exceptionally well those defined in the building program:

Material Return Slots is not adjacent, but is close to Public Entrance/Lobby/Community Information. (BP 33)
Information Service Desk is not in the sight line from the Multi-Purpose Community Room and Homework Center. (BP 43)

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

Roles and responsibilities are clearly delineated and it seems that the county is taking a more active role in providing services than the school district. Service hours do not include specifics about when the specific services will be available. The district has committed to provide staff for the homework center 3 afternoons, while the current staffing levels in the library (see comments in Plan of Service) will probably limit the amount of support that can be provided by the library staff. In-kind funding commitments from the district include \$8,000 for staff and \$1,000 for textbooks, while there are general comments about what the library will provide. The review and modification process will occur on a quarterly basis during the first year and there will be focus groups that will include community members and parents so that services can be modified, if needed. This partnering effort seems to have the potential of continuing a viable partnership that will help everyone in this small community.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

R2

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The needs assessment process built upon the Godbe, county-wide ballot measure survey results with specific focus groups, community meetings and other needs assessment techniques to ensure input specifically from the Orange Cove community. Details of the various methods and their results were provided in extensive appendices. The community analysis provided an excellent presentation of community and demographic characteristics, with an analysis including potential impacts for library services. The extremely depressed and poverty-stricken community is clearly doing what its residents can to improve conditions, including taxing themselves via a bond issue to improve schools. Also included in the community analysis are two full pages of initiatives the community is undertaking for improvement of the business and economic climate, education, and quality of life. The service needs analysis used an excellent combination of community analysis, demographics, and specific community needs assessment input to provide bases for the various service needs defined. The space needs assessment allocates "at least" 22% of the non-periodicals collection to Spanish language materials, while they indicate that over 70% of the population is primarily Spanish-speaking. They did give the rationale for only 22% as being that the community respondents reported an emphasis on teaching all children only in English, and they did indicate that an emphasis of the periodicals collection would be on Spanish-language materials to encourage interest from that group of adults - but provided no percentage for that amount. They might want to re-visit with their community whether the Spanish language proportions are sufficient. The overall executive summary provided an excellent summary of the K-12 and general population and their needs as well as an overall description of Orange Cove.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The mission statement was well done, with excellent connections from the Fresno county-wide and school district mission statements to Orange Cove. Many of the goals and some of the objectives were specifically user-centered and many of the objectives were measurable. None of the service indicators was outcomes-based but certainly represent reasonable indicators of levels of library success in addressing the objectives. The breakout of facility vs. collection vs. service objectives was particularly effective, and this combination, along with the narrative presentation on types of services, made the library planning for the community extremely clear and resulted in an outstanding project that should be exceptionally responsive to the Orange Cove community and its needs. Many parts of the plan contained text that was the same or similar to that in the Fowler plan; however, the duplicative text was in areas where it is realistic that the two branches would have similar approaches to serving their different clienteles, and they are in all cases individualized throughout, so that it is clear they are taking into consideration the dissimilarities between the communities as well as the similarities. County-wide planning is certainly clear in the jurisdiction-wide "fit" discussion and there are included some implications re how Orange Cove would fit into this planning; a more specific presentation of those connections would have been excellent.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The general requirements were a fine combination of basic good library-design criteria in general along with appropriate specifics to Orange Cove. ADA and Power and Data were well-defined here, with excellent additional detail in the space descriptions. The spatial relationships seemed appropriate and clear. Some "Away" specifications, such as children's Away from adult and teen areas, would have been useful. In addition, they might want to consider more specific sight lines between one of the two service desks and the public restrooms, since apparently there is only the one set to be used by all: children and adults. All spaces seemed well sized and clearly described. This should provide an excellent guide for building design.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

Net-assignable space on the plans matches the building program extremely well even though there were several instances where the architect misstated the building program's square footage (Multi-purpose room etc.) on the conceptual plan. It appears that the architect may have been working from an earlier version of the program. The variances were not particularly significant.

Non-assignable space on the plans matches what was called for in the building program extremely well.

The conceptual plan meets the spatial relationships called for in the building program exceptionally well with the only significant concern being rather questionable secondary access through what appears to be the community room to get from the outside into the library and provide access to the book return slots. This will need to be studied further and very possibly modified. This may have an impact on the size of the multipurpose room which is already somewhat on the small size. Further, the floor plan shows the Family Homework Center located next to the children's picture book section and a fair distance from the teen area. If teen use of the homework center is anticipated, it will probably be limited because of this location.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Homework Center located next to the children's picture book section and a fair distance from the teen area. If teen use of the homework center is anticipated, it will probably be limited because of this location.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

This joint use agreement is essentially the same as that for Fowler and has the same good points and problems. The roles and responsibilities were clear and well-defined but implied much more active support on the part of the county than the district, although the district does commit to some very specific support. The services are clear and should be very useful for the students and their parents. Hours of service of the library are provided but not for the various joint ventures. The Homework Center will be open and staffed at least 3 evenings per week for 2 hours each, by district teachers. Staffed operation of the other services is unclear. They seem to be trying to accomplish an awful lot with very limited staffing and no explanation about how they hope to provide effective services with the limited staffing. No specific support level was committed to nor estimated by the county, only by the district. A funding commitment seems apparent by the parties but, it is difficult to determine its adequacy for the uses proposed. An excellent review and modification process is described, beginning with quarterly timing in year 1 and moving to semi-annually thereafter, with provision for user input from a number of sources.

R3:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A broad range of methods was used during the needs assessment process to gather input from community residents, and the methods achieved broad representation. A professional research firm conducted two phone surveys to determine user satisfaction and library service needs. The community meetings that were held appear to have served to fine-tune the input and keep the community informed of the progress of the library project. The focus groups and other small group meetings appear to have elicited more specific library service needs. The key informant interviews served to provide an overview of community growth and general library needs. The community analysis is very thorough, including age breakdowns in smaller increments to enable greater focus. The previous API scores were provided to enable comparison to the current levels. Demographics were clearly presented via graphs and charts, enabling users to find pertinent information at a glance. The space needs assessment includes an introductory chart that summarizes the square footage for all library spaces, which is helpful in providing an overview of the project. The document includes an excellent description of how a collection will be balanced between English- and Spanish-language materials in this largely Hispanic community. Standards are cited for the square footage allocations, and the rationale behind them is included.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The service plan blends the needs assessment findings into the goals, objectives, and service responses, demonstrating clear links to the needs assessment. Objectives are organized into categories: facility, collection, and services. The service indicators are not qualitative, which will not be as helpful in determining how well the services are responding to the needs. Of concern is the intention to combine the multipurpose community room with the homework center, which limits the use of both.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The building program provides appropriate spaces to accommodate the planned library services. The general requirements section is very thorough and specific to this library, making it a valuable tool for the design team in developing a design solution. Spatial relationships are clearly described in a separate chart and within each space. Individual space sheets are very thorough and well described.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The net assignable SF in this 7,000 SF project has a difference of 44 SF between the building program and the plan. Most of the data has been successfully transferred from the building program to the plan. The plan is clear, accurate, and excellent.

The non-assignable SF in this project is delivered at the building program level of 25%. This is quite appropriate for a building of this size.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Most of the space relations in this building program are accurately displayed on the plan. There are several minor exceptions:

- p. 33 Entrance not adjacent material return slot.
- p. 43 MP room not in line of sight to information desk.
- p. 48 Mix up with the descriptions: 1.4.1 space A+B is 177 SF but the description addresses AV which is 1.4.2 with 267 SF; seems AV not accounted for in the building program.
- p. 63 How do you get exterior control from the circulation desk.
- p. 77 Information desk not line of sight MP room.
- p. 84 AV not in line of sight of main travel path.
- p. 150 6.3 Plan shows building maintenance/ supply; the building program shows mechanical/building maintenance.
 - 1.4.3 kitchenette and 6.4 electrical room not in building program.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

The roles and responsibilities are clearly described, and the joint venture services are well detailed. However, the hours of service are given for the public library, but not for any of the joint venture services. Staffing will be provided in the homework center by the school district for two hours a day, three days a week, but the use of library staff is unclear. The frequency of the training activities to be provided is unclear, nor is library staff to present. Because it is unclear what staff will be present to assist with the joint venture service, it cannot be determined if sufficient staff will be available to carryout the planned services. Funding is mentioned in general terms with operating funds being provided by the county. There is a specific amount of funding listed to be provided by the school district in in-kind services (staff and textbooks), but the overall cost to provide the joint venture services is not indicated, making it difficult to assess funding adequacy. The review and modification process, which will occur quarterly initially and switch to annually after the first year, includes focus groups of students, teachers, and community members as well as school district and library staff members. The agreement clearly describes a long-term partnership.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Integration of Electronic Technologies

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	3	4
3	4	4

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

The proposed technology services are very responsive to findings in the needs assessment. There will be 28 OPACS plus 10 laptops to be used in technology lab. Planning documents for the San Joaquin Valley Library System, the plan for the school district, and an explanation about support that is being provided were included with the plan of service. Wiring capability will provide interoperability for existing services and anticipates future growth, allowing for efficient reconfigurations and additions for future technological advancements. There is a discrepancy concerning the number of computer workstations in the children's area: The Plan of Service identifies 4 (pg. 60), and the Building Program indicates 3 (pg. 118).

R2:

Electronic technologies, clearly in support of the needs assessment results, are exceptionally well documented in the plan of service. It includes a combination of information specific to the technologies planned for this community library and an excellent presentation of the support the library will receive from county-wide and the San Joaquin Valley Library System resources. There is also a discussion of how the school district technology planning fits in. The technology section in the plan of service relates specifically to residents of the service area library, providing responses to their library service needs that the result is a very good presentation. In the building program, electronic technologies support is included in multiple places in the general requirements section and is amplified well in the space descriptions. There is a little confusion concerning wireless, which the plan of service says should be considered as deemed feasible by county information technology staff. The space descriptions contain a mixture of either wireless or wired access, as well as a wireless requirement in the same space descriptions, making the topic of wireless unclear. Overall, however, electronic technologies provided for in the plan of service and the building program should provide excellent support that is clearly defined for this library.

R3:

The planning documents demonstrate an understanding of the need for technology in providing public library services, and the technology solutions are responsive to the needs assessment findings. Among the technology solutions to be provided are 12 laptops to be on a mobile caddy and used as needed and a technology learning lab. The general requirements section of the building program does a particularly good job of describing the need for future flexibility to provide for technological advances. Wireless access is under consideration. The building program provides for hard-wired computer access and mentions wireless access in those spaces where it will be most needed, providing well for future needs.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Site

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

N/A

Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: OK

Geotechnical issues: There are no geotechnical issues which will significantly increase the costs of developing the site.

R1:

The proposed location is in the center of Orange Cove on the intersection of Park Boulevard which is the main street that runs through the center of town. All of the shopping and the majority of government services are within 1 block of the site. All of the schools in the community are located less than 1/2 mile from the site. The site is bordered on the east by Hwy. 63 and on the north by Hwy. 180 and is adjacent to the Senior Center and the City Park. There are two public transit stops that stop in front of the library. There is a proposed bicycle path that will run through the library property and will link the 5 schools and the 3 parks. There are 12 bicycle parking spaces. There are 60 on-site parking spaces (57 required) and a total of 110 automobile parking spaces. There were other sites considered, input from the community, and criteria was included along with a rationale for selection of this particular site.

R2:

This site is centrally located in a library service area that is long and narrow. Further, the proposed site is centrally located in the community of Orange Cove which is the major population center within the service area.

The proposed library site is located on Park Blvd., the main street through town, and has 3,400 vehicles per day 3 blocks from the site.

There are 60 parking spaces on-site and another 50 spaces available on-street and within 500' of the front door.

There are 12 covered bike rack parking spaces that are visible from a public service desk.

The library is part of a main business district revitalization plan.

The site selection process involved significant community involvement. Further, 3 alternate sites were seriously considered and the reasons why 2 of the sites were discarded were given as well as the site selection criteria that were used to select the proposed site were given in the application.

There is a future expansion of both the parking and building shown on the site plan.

R3:

The Orange Cove site is in the center of town, on the intersection of Park Blvd. and the RR right of way, now a bike/pedestrian trail. Also there is a bike path linking the site to the schools. Like other rural Fresno Co. communities, there is intercity bus service, and local shuttle service for seniors and kids, with a covered bus stop at the library; dial a ride is also provided. Onsite parking slightly exceeds code, and many more parking spaces are available on the street nearby. 12 covered (if funds permit) and staff visible bike slots are provided.

The site is a combination of a good rectangle with a good triangle attached; sensibly, the building is in the triangle and the parking the rectangle. However, the situation makes a good part of the site unusable.

The location between the commercial part of Park Blvd. and the City Hall and related functions, and the connection to the bike path next to the schools, makes this attractive. It enhances redevelopment efforts.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM
3042 - Orange Cove Neighborhood Library

Financial Capacity

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.